



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes City Council

Tuesday, October 17, 2017

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

NOMINATING & RULES SPECIAL CALLED MEETING AT 4:30 P.M.

PUBLIC SERVICES SPECIAL CALLED MEETING AT 4:45 P.M.

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING AT 5:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER BY MAYOR PERRIN AT 5:30 P.M.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND INVOCATION

3. ROLL CALL BY CITY CLERK DONNA JACKSON

Present 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent 1 - Charles Frierson

4. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

Mayor Perrin stated that Mr. Downing and Mr. Rickert could not make it this evening so we will move those over to the next meeting agenda. He stated that the other presentation is on the guidelines. The city attorney is still working on those with Derrel Smith which is our senior planner.

[COM-17:069](#)

INTRODUCTION OF VICE PRESIDENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MIKE DOWNING AND DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS CRAIG RICKERT OF JONESBORO UNLIMITED BY MAYOR PERRIN

[COM-17:070](#)

UPDATE ON DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT BY CITY PLANNER DERREL SMITH

Attachments: [Opponents for Multifamily09262017.pdf](#)
[Opponents for Multifamily10022017.pdf](#)

5. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of the Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Moore, seconded by Councilman Gene Vance, to Approve the Consent Agenda. The motioned PASSED

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

MIN-17:115

Minutes for the City Council meeting on October 3, 2017

Attachments: [Council Minutes 10032017.pdf](#)

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

RES-17:137

A RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT DEEDS FOR REAL PROPERTY LOCATED NEXT TO ALLEN PARK

Attachments: [Correction Quitclaim Deed](#)
[Quitclaim Deed](#)

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

RES-17:143

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS TO MAKE AN APPOINTMENT TO THE COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD (JET)

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

RES-17:149

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY CLERK TO SIGN THE RELEASE AND SUBROGATION AGREEMENT WITH EMC INSURANCE REGARDING WOODBRIDGE SUBDIVISION, PHASE III

Attachments: [Release and Subrogation Agreement](#)

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

RES-17:161

RESOLUTION FOR THE ADOPTION OF A REGULATED FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE COLLECTIONS DEPARTMENT

Attachments: [Privilege License Fee.pdf](#)

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

RES-17:162

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESOLUTION 17:092 AMENDING THE INSPECTION DEPARTMENT PERMIT FEE FOR FOUNDATION AND FOOTINGS

This item was APPROVED on the consent agenda.

6. NEW BUSINESS

ORDINANCES ON FIRST READING

ORD-17:079

AN ORDINANCE TO ESTABLISH A FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE COLLECTIONS

DEPARTMENT AND ADOPTION OF AN EMERGENCY CLAUSE FOR THE
EFFICIENT OPERATION OF CITY GOVERNMENT

Attachments: [Privilege License Fee.pdf](#)

Mayor Perrin stated that on this ordinance we are going to have a motion to add the emergency clause. Councilmember Street motioned, seconded by Councilmember Hafner to suspend the rules and offer by title only. All voted aye.

Councilmember Hafner stated that at the Finance meeting, due to the timing of this and how much time it takes to put into effect, they decided there needs to be an emergency clause added. Councilmember Hafner motioned, seconded by Councilmember Street, to amend ORD-17:079 in order to add an emergency clause because the City Collector will need time to put the new fees into the system, print and prepare for mailing. Therefore, for the financial continuity of the City of Jonesboro, an emergency is declared to exist and this ordinance shall take effect from and after its passage and approval. All voted aye.

Councilmember Street motioned, seconded by Councilmember Gibson to suspend the rules and waive the second and third readings. All voted aye.

Councilmember Gibson motioned, seconded by Councilmember Williams to adopt the emergency clause. With the exception of Councilmember Bryant, all present voted aye.

Councilmember Vance said there is a resolution in the Consent Agenda that has the same attachment that this resolution does. Councilmember Moore said it was RES-17:161. Councilmember Vance said the attachment is the same and the wording on the resolution is almost exactly the same as that of the ordinance. Have we adopted the same thing twice? Mayor Perrin said you approved the resolution and now you are approving the ordinance which is the dollar amount to collect. Councilmember Vance said he was questioning it because they both have the same attachment. City Clerk Donna Jackson stated that what the resolution does is set those fees and the ordinance allows for the fees. It is done by resolution so that they can amend that without having to pass an ordinance. Councilmember Vance questioned if the attachment belonged on the ordinance. Ms. Jackson said the attachment followed afterwards so we attached it both to the resolution and to the ordinance. Councilmember Vance asked if the attachment was part of the ordinance. He said it was a part of the resolution. Ms. Jackson said we were asked to put it with the ordinance so we put it with both. City Attorney Carol Duncan said that it is a reference on the ordinance. It was adopted in the resolution. Councilmember Vance asked if the next time there are changes to fees, it will be by resolution. Mayor Perrin and Ms. Duncan said correct.

A motion was made by Councilman John Street, seconded by Councilwoman Ann Williams, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 10 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner and David McClain

Nay: 1 - LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

ORD-17:080

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 117, KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE

PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN ZONING BOUNDARIES FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1110 LOBERG LANE FROM RESIDENTIAL, R-1 TO RM-8, L.U.O. AS REQUESTED BY CHRIS ISHMAEL

Attachments:

[Ordinance.docm](#)
[Ordinance.pdf](#)
[Plat.pdf](#)
[Application.pdf](#)
[Staff Summary.pdf](#)
[Site Plan Layout.pdf](#)
[Rendering of Project.pdf](#)
[rezoning plat.pdf](#)
[Aerial view of Location.pdf](#)
[Land Survey.pdf](#)
[Letter about receipts from USPS.pdf](#)
[Picture of Lot.pdf](#)
[Handout.pdf](#)
[Handhout from neighbors.pdf](#)
[Email from Judy Casteel.pdf](#)
[Letter from Renter for Rezoning.pdf](#)
[Neighbor address of pictures.pdf](#)
[Opposition Letter from Mr. Cudd.pdf](#)
[Opposition Letter from Shirley Moore.pdf](#)
[2nd Opposition Letter from Shirley Moore.pdf](#)
[Opposition Emails.pdf](#)
[Opposition.pdf](#)
[R Williams Opposition.pdf](#)
[R Williams.pdf](#)
[2015-StatusReport_AR.pdf](#)
[Petition Signed By Neighbors.pdf](#)
[Petition Signed By Neighbors 2.pdf](#)
[Pictures from Mary Beth Williams.pdf](#)
[Pictures from Neighbors.pdf](#)

Councilmember Street said that for the purposes of getting it before Council, he motioned, seconded by Councilmember Long, to suspend the rules and offer by title only. All voted aye.

Mayor Perrin said that he figured there would be people in the audience on both sides of this issue that want to speak. He said that we will start off with the proponents.

George Hamman from Civilogic, 203 Southwest Drive, said that they did meet with the Planning Commission on two occasions. We met back in September and then again in October. We realize there are some that are opposed to this and we have addressed their concerns to the best of our ability. Their first voiced concern was an increase in traffic. While we agree there will be a slight increase in traffic, we are only asking for twelve duplex units. These are two bedroom townhouse units. While there will be a slight increase in traffic, it won't be much. Loberg Lane has been with the past Master Plan and the most recently adopted Master Street Plan, classified as a minor arterial so the City already recognizes that there will be increased traffic on Loberg Lane. They

mention noise as a problem. Again, these units are two bedroom townhouse units. They are not large units where you could have a large group of roommates or even a large family. Noise should not be a big problem with this.

They were also concerned about the appearance of the place. We have requested and as part of the ordinance and through the Planning Commission that we be allowed to place a privacy fence on the northeast and south sides of the development at a height of eight feet. Typically, it is about six feet. They mention trash getting away from the containers and being blown around the neighborhood. If that should happen, the privacy fence should catch anything and keep it from going into the neighborhood any further. One gentleman expressed drainage concerns. The City adopted a stormwater management manual quite a few years ago. Engineers and developers must adhere to that. When we have a development like this, we are obligated to put in a facility to slow down the runoff.

They are also concerned about the large trees in the areas. We do have a layout, a site plan layout that we had prepared to show that we are going to lose very few trees if any. We have some trees around the perimeter. As you can see in the site plan layout, we are planning on putting six duplexes on the property, but it is not going to take up nearly all of the property. Almost all of the large trees will remain and be undisturbed. They were also concerned about the entrance location. We do have the flexibility to move that to the east side of the property instead of the west side. There is an existing driveway over there and we could put the new entrance on that side as well and make that maybe a little bit better intersection as well. The other point that I would like to make is that the subdivision that surrounds this on all three sides is R-2 property and there are a number of rental homes in that subdivision. Should one of those rental homes be destroyed by some means, tornado, fire, flood, what have you, the owner would have the right to go in there on that R-2 lot and construct a duplex without any other permission other than for buying his permit. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Perrin asked Mr. Hamman if he presented about eight items of concern. As you were going through those items, I listed eight individual items that you have been discussing with the property owners. Mr. Hamman said yes, that was right. Mayor Perrin said he just wanted to make sure.

Mayor Perrin said that we will now go to those who are in opposition.

Judy Casteel, 1902 Independence Cove, said she stands here as a spokesperson for the Scenic Hills Neighborhood Association. We have not had a conversation with Mr. Hamman or Mr. Ishmael. The only conversation has been in a setting like this where we tell what our concern is and they answer with their concerns. As far as any sit down conversation is concerned, there hasn't been one. I am not going to speak with you very long because I have several neighbors that would like to speak to you as well. I do want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and thank you for responses to the email that I sent. I very much appreciate that as do my neighbors. Our concerns are as Mr. Hamman has listed. With six duplexes, you still have the potential for at least 24 vehicles. So that is still quite a few vehicles on this piece of property. The pond is a concern because it is on a slope. The retention pond is on the back portion of this property which falls. It is rather difficult to put a pond on a slope. I am going to let another of the neighbors speak to the fencing and the buffers. If they move the driveway to the other side, there are going to be two pecan trees on that side that will be lost. There is no way you can get that driveway in there. The only other thing that I would quickly like to point out is as I told the MAPC, in Scenic Hills Editions I and II, we already have nine townhouses, ten duplexes, four quadplexes, two apartment

complexes; one with 20 units and another with 24 units respectively. Our neighborhood association is bound on the north and the south sides by W. Nettleton and W. Matthews and on the east and west by Strawfloor Drive and Gee Street. Within that area, we have 21 duplexes, 3 triplexes, 11 quadplexes, 15 townhouses, 4 apartment complexes; 1 with 8 apartments, 1 with 20 apartments, 1 with 52 apartments, and another with 55 apartments. There are also two new quadplexes being built on W. Matthews and I see footings on W. Nettleton between two apartment buildings for something that is going up. I'm sure Mr. Smith could tell us. I haven't had the opportunity to speak to him, but I feel certain that is also going to be multi-door. We just kind of feel like we have contributed quite a bit in our area to the diversity. We have no problems with duplexes, quadplexes, etc. Multifamily units are an important makeup in the overall picture of a healthy city. That is not a problem, but we do feel that we have given our fair share so to speak. My last point would be to point out to you that Mr. Ishmael did know that this property was zoned R-1 when he purchased it. I appreciate your time and if you don't mind, I would like to have Mr. Webb speak.

Jeff Webb, 2414 Timberridge, said his home is directly below this particular property. This property sits upon a very tall hill and we have experienced a number of drainage issues with it. I have about a 6-8 foot fall off of it. As someone who has built retention ponds in the past, I understand the purpose is to slow the rainfall down. My concern has to do with mosquito control because any kind of control that was done would be washed out. We are basically building a breeding ground for mosquitos in here. We have one foot of clearance currently with my next door neighbor and their walkout basement. If anything disturbs that, then they will be flooded. We have seen a year of 100-year rains over and over again this last year. I know the engineers are good. I know they do their best, but if a mistake is made, people will be flooded. We also know that developers do not buy these properties or build these properties for long-term purposes. All of these wonderful promises they are making, within a year or two, this property will be sold to someone else who will normally have a cash flow issue on the front end and will not be wanting to go in and enlarge ponds, spend \$5,000-\$10,000 to prepare and fix these drainage issues without a lawsuit. I also have some major concerns. I am a commercial driver. I have a class A drivers license. The egress of off this property is that I have a very special insight for. Two hundred and sixty two feet of visibility on the south side of oncoming traffic. At 30 mph, that is five seconds. I have been trained by the UPS Drivers Training School and one of the things they taught us is that people move their vehicles before they know there is clearance. They pull up and look left and see nobody and they look right and then begin to move forward. When they do that, they cut that five seconds down to 2-3 seconds. And, that is assuming that people are using 30 mph. We know that they don't always do that. I have to ask the question why? Why are we doing this? We are doing it for one man. Hundreds and hundreds of families are going to be inconvenienced and have financial loss and danger because of this so that one man can prosper. We are a mature neighborhood. We don't have large expanses that are suddenly going to have a building boom because of this. We live in a society that is innocent until proven guilty. In other words, you have to make a compelling case for before you can change your status. We have had no compelling case for. We have been on the offensive from the very beginning of all of this. We have had to prove why not. They have never once proved why. I think the reason is that because of all of the benefits to rezoning this begin and end on this one property. One man will make a profit while the rest of us suffer. Thank you.

Bart McDermott, 2022 Timberridge, said my wife and I bought our house about a year and half ago. The reason we moved to that location was to get away from the apartments we were living by on Golf Course Drive across town. The noise was so bad

we decided to move. We do not want to be back in that situation again. That was pretty much the only reason we moved from that location. Another quick point is the traffic on Loberg is just insane. Our property is at the very top of the hill on Loberg and there are cars that go 60+ mph all day long. It became a cutoff road between Matthews and Nettleton. People cut through there all day long. My wife was involved in a head-on collision. She was pulling into our driveway and she got hit head-on and it slung the car almost into the cemetery on Loberg. It is absolutely insane how fast people go. If you add twelve duplexes, it is just going to be that much worse. You can't see on either side of the hill. As fast as people drive, you don't have time to react.

Shane Perkins, 1108 Loberg Lane, said after 13 years in the military, I decided to retire here in Jonesboro. My wife and I bought this house on Loberg in a mature, great community. Everybody seems to know and like everybody and then this started. They say they are going to build an eight-foot privacy fence. Most of the homes are two-stories in our area. My deck raises up eight feet. I can walk out on my deck and literally, I can see the entire community. I have a six-foot privacy fence. An eight-foot privacy fence is not going to help. As far as noise buffering that is not going to help either because he is going to be on the top of this hill. Literally, everyone is going to be able to see these buildings. It worries me as far as security and privacy. Once you start renting, there is nobody that is going to be able to stop that. I'm very against it. Thank you very much for listening to me.

Rennette Wilson, 1104 Loberg Lane, said she lives about three houses down from that property. We bought our house about 7 ½ years ago. The reason we purchased that property where we are now is because it is a quiet neighborhood. Traffic was really low at the time. We exercise and I go running on Loberg. Lately, the traffic has started to increase so I really have to stick to the side of the road because there is no sidewalk. Sometimes my whole family goes out and we going running and biking. I fear that by adding more duplexes on the street and more vehicles here, it would greatly diminish the quality of life that I have and that I have greatly enjoyed now that we have purchased our property on Loberg. It really concerns me to think that there will be more traffic and more housing there. I am really concerned about that. Thank you.

Vicky Carroll, 2004 Meadowood Cove, said she resides there with her husband Ron. We are original homeowners. We have lived in our home for 38 years. We are against this proposition of rezoning because we have apartments directly across from our home. When they were first built, they were landscaped and they looked nice. In the past 20 years though, they have fallen into deep disrepair. All of the landscaping is gone. There are no more bushes or trees. The siding is falling off. The gutters have fallen off and they are an eyesore. We know that when the time comes if we ever decide, we hope not to sell our house any time soon, but when we do, we won't get the value for it that we hope we would get for it. The other thing is that Mr. Hamman's said that Mr. Ishmael wanted to rent these apartments to young professionals. I don't think you can guarantee that those are the only people who are going to live there. And, as we have seen with the apartments across the street from us, there have been a variety of people that have moved in and out of those apartments, some good and some bad. We have had a lot of police cars visiting those apartments. In view of safety, we don't want to lose the neighbors that we have living in the neighborhood because of these apartments. We don't want people we like to feel like they have to move because these apartments are being built. We would like for all of the homeowners that live there now and feel comfortable living there to remain living there. Thank you.

Rena Williams, 2000 Bunker Hill, said she opposes the rezoning of 1110 Loberg Lane. In the rendering of the project file that is available on the City Council website provided

by the developer, the units pictured are townhouses and townhouses are not accessible. I don't support building another complex in my neighborhood that sends a message of exclusion to disabled Arkansans. According to the data from the 2015 Disability Status Report on Arkansas from Cornell University. The prevalence of disability in Arkansas was 17.3% for all persons of all ages. 10.3% of those people reported an ambulatory disability meaning that they had to have help with walking or climbing stairs. As of the 2010 census, Jonesboro is the fifth largest city in Arkansas. We are also the largest city in Northeast Arkansas. How many people inside those percentages live in Jonesboro and how many of those people inside of those percentages might want to move to Jonesboro? We can extrapolate from the 2015 data that if Arkansas has grown then the percentage of the population with ambulatory disabilities has also gone up. I will email each of you a link to this report which was created with data from the American Community Survey which is part of the U.S. Census. I don't support any additional multifamily development that locks out disabled Arkansans. It is exclusionary. It is ablest and frankly, it should be embarrassing to us that given our position in Northeast Arkansas we are not acting as a leader on issues of accessibility. In 2017, there is no excuse for a developer to not make a percentage of the units accessible to people with ambulatory disabilities. Do we want disabled Arkansans to see our city as dismissive or hostile to their issues? Do we want them to think that they are unwelcome here or do we want them to feel welcomed, accommodated, and valued as city residents? The Council should reject the requested rezoning of 1110 Loberg Lane for opting to build inaccessible townhouses. And, as matter of fact, the Council should reject any future rezoning request that proposes development of multifamily housing which ignores the needs of disabled Arkansans who live in Jonesboro or may move to Jonesboro in the future. Does the Council have any questions?

Kay Davis, 2009 Mt. Vernon, said right where Bunker Hill and Mt. Vernon come together, we are very close to Loberg Lane. We have lived there also for 38 years having purchased our home shortly after the subdivision was started. I will ask if you will please look at the size of this lot that is proposed for rezoning. If you have not looked at it in person, I wish you would. It is far too small for what they have configured to put on it. There won't be enough space for a sanitation truck to turn around or back up and especially if it is a size truck that empties a dumpster if there is one there. Then, consider emergency vehicles that have to come in that one way and out the same way. When there is a fire, usually they send two trucks and there can be the City Fire Chief's SUV and possibly an ambulance. What is an ambulance going to do if it can't get to a person who is having a heart attack? In addition, we depend upon the Jonesboro Police Department for all that they do in helping to keep us safe. Why should we make it more difficult for them to get to where they need to be? Where are all the tenant's guests going to park if the two allotted spaces are filled? Trying to get in and out of Loberg Lane is difficult and in fact, to me, it is frightening. We all know that traffic accidents not only incapacitate, but they can take a precious human life in an instant. I would sure hate to have it on my conscious that I had voted for this project. Let's only do positive things for our city that we live in and love. I thank all of you very much.

Mark Taylor, 2007 Mt. Vernon, said his neighbor was the last lady Kay. We have a unique neighborhood. There are four funeral homes within two blocks of each other and a cremation resting area that has just been put in in the last two weeks. If you have traffic five blocks from you and increasing because of this man's accident, I am the one that talked to the officer and told him what I saw. A Bono auxiliary fireman made a bad decision going over a hill because 30 mph is not safe on that hill. I hope water doesn't flow that fast. We are homeowners. We are retired business owners,

homeowners, retired military. I grew up in the neighborhood four block away when I was going to Jonesboro High School in the '60's. I played on the hill and in the back trees that are in my yard in the late 60's. I have seen our community develop and I have seen some things that we need to make better choices for. Look within yourself. Look at your home when you go home tonight. Look in the perimeters. Help us, our R-1 area of Scenic Hills. It is very important that we continue our lives on the west part of town. There is nothing beyond us, a bypass. There are many churches in the area. What I am seeing more and more of because of the cemetery lane from Strawfloor to Loberg, we are finding more and more people. We are trying to keep it from being any more not diverted or criminal. Criminal things are starting to develop more and more in our neighborhood. Homeowners pay taxes. Renters take taxes. Please understand. If you had a home in our area, if you come in our area before you make this vote, you will find out that this may be the best decision to opt to make no decision and allow this man to build a home and not an apartment. Thank you.

Councilmember Street motioned to hold it to three readings. Hold this one at one.

City Clerk Donna Jackson asked Ms. Williams if she could get a copy of her handout.

This item was Held at one reading.

ORD-17:081

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 117, KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN ZONING BOUNDARIES FROM I-1, INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT TO RM-16, RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1106 EAST JOHNSON AS REQUESTED BY K & A INVESTMENT, LLC

Attachments: [Ordinance 10-11-17.docx](#)
[plat.pdf](#)
[Staff Summary - Council.pdf](#)
[Application.pdf](#)
[Deed.pdf](#)
[Letter To Public about Public Meeting.pdf](#)
[Neighborhood Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)
[Opposition Email from Attorney.pdf](#)
[Plan.pdf](#)
[Aerial View of Location.pdf](#)
[Property Owner Notifications.pdf](#)
[Rezoning Plat.pdf](#)
[USPS Returned Green Cards.pdf](#)

Councilmember Street motioned, seconded by Councilmember Moore, to suspend the rules and offer by title only. All voted aye.

Benton Smith, representing K & A Investments, LLC, 519 W. Washington, said that many of you are familiar with this property. It is .58 acres on E. Johnson. It is the old Totem Pole Pawn store. Then, it was Wolf Den. It has been closed for about two years. My client is seeking this ordinance to have it rezoned to RM-16 and has proposed to build a 6-8 plex which will be very aesthetically pleasing. I think it will be a welcomed addition to the community. I think it will fit in. My client feels that it will fit in well with the E. Johnson community. We reached out to the neighbors and requested about 2 ½ weeks ago for them to attend a meeting at my law office. Unfortunately, no one attended. I have spoken to a neighbor who has a business next door. It is University Auto Center. He was somewhat concerned from his vantage point, because he sometimes works on cars at night. He was concerned about people living next door,

but did not file an opposition or have anything other than those comments that he made to me when we met. I think it would be a welcome addition. I will be happy to answer any questions and thank you for your time.

Mayor Perrin said he knows where the totem pole is. Do the dimensions of that lot take into consideration the car wash or body shop next door to that? Ms. Smith said University Auto Center next door and has those car washes. That is the edge boundary. My client intends to go through the process and build a privacy fence there. That is the eastern most boundary.

Councilmember Coleman asked if that was on the north side of University Auto Center. Mr. Smith said the north side would be University Auto Center. It has kind of a fenced in area where he has some cars. There are two vacant lots behind there. Brian Smallman owns that property and has recently purchased in the last six months or so. Councilmember Coleman asked if there was a plumbing office right down there on the corner. Mr. Smith said that is correct. It would be northeast.

Councilmember Hafner stated he may have misunderstood what Mr. Smith said. They are requesting an RM-16, but you said it would be like a 6-8 plex. Mr. Smith said yes. Councilmember Hafner asked why they didn't request an RM-8 instead of an RM-16. Mr. Smith said he believes with the requirements to build the 8-plex, it would need to be the 16 for that project. Councilmember Hafner asked if that was right. Councilmember Moore said the square footage is different on RM-8 and RM-16 and that is why, but he can't necessarily build 16 units on that lot. It will be based on the square footage determined even though it will be zoned. The square footage will determine the total number and its less square footage than if he was requesting an RM-8. Councilmember Hafner said thank you. Mr. Smith said it is based upon the lot size.

Councilmember McClain asked about reaching out to residents in the area. Did you reach out to residents in the apartments? Did you reach out to surrounding businesses? Who all would you say you reached out to? Mr. Smith said we sent two separate letters. One was advising of the MAPC meeting and a separate letter advising them of that meeting and inviting them to a meeting at my office to all of the surrounding property owners in the area. We did not reach out to anyone who was not a property owner, but we reached out to them that we received from the MAPC staff. Councilmember McClain asked if they reached out to the property owners of the apartments to the north, the box factory, Cooper, Jimmy Alexander, Alexander's Machine Shop, but none of the residents of the apartments were ever contacted? Mr. Smith said none of the residents of the apartments were, only the property owners of that apartment. There is an apartment complex probably about 150 yards due north of this location. Councilmember McClain asked if Mr. Smith was talking about the two-story apartment complex. Mr. Smith said he believes so. Mayor Perrin said it would be directly behind. Mr. Smith said they are not directly on Johnson. Councilmember McClain inquired as to the number of units they plan to put in. Mr. Smith said they plan on putting a 6-8 plex. It will be one unit, but with six or eight units in it.

Councilmember McClain said he would hold it at one reading.

This item was Held at one reading.

ORD-17:082

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 117, KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS, PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN ZONING BOUNDARIES FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4517 E. PARKER ROAD FROM INDUSTRIAL, I-2 TO C-3, COMMERCIAL AS REQUESTED BY S & K GARDENS, LLC

Attachments: [Ordinance.doc](#)
 [Plat.pdf](#)
 [Application.pdf](#)
 [Staff Summary - Council.pdf](#)
 [Deed.pdf](#)
 [Aerial View of Location.pdf](#)
 [Property Owner Notifications.pdf](#)
 [USPS Receipts.pdf](#)

Councilmember Moore motioned, seconded by Councilmember Gibson, to suspend the rules and read by title only. All voted aye.

Bobby Gibson with Waddell, Cole, and Jones Law Firm, 310 East Street, said he represents the applicant. This property is where the Harmony Gardens Landscaping business used to be located. It is out of business now. I-2 is good for that use. The building that is actually constructed on the lot now is a very, very nice building. The owners feel that it could be better used as a commercial retail type establishment. We ask for the C-3 zoning for that purpose. It certainly does not offend any of the uses in the area of that location. There are obviously other I-2 uses, but also several commercial establishments in that area. Obviously, directly across the interstate, there is a multitude of commercial uses. I think that it is just the beginning of a trend probably to have more commercial uses down the access roads in our city. If you have any specific questions, I will be glad to answer any of those for you.

Councilmember Gene Vance asked if this was right next door to the Nettleton School District Administration. Mr. Gibson said it is not right next door. In between Nettleton, there would be another business owner by the applicant, Syntel. Mayor Perrin asked if this is where they rent out or want to rent out. Mr. Gibson said yes. Councilmember McClain asked if they wanted to rent it out for weddings and that kind of stuff. Mr. Gibson said they want to use it as an event venue. Mayor Perrin said events is what I am saying. Councilmember Moore said they are currently doing that. Mayor Perrin said yes they are currently doing that now and it is a nice building.

Councilmember Moore motioned, seconded by Councilmember Vance, to suspend the rules and waive the second reading and hold it there. All voted aye.

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Moore, seconded by Councilman Gene Vance, that this matter be Waived Second Reading . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

RESOLUTIONS TO BE INTRODUCED

RES-17:152

A RESOLUTION FOR THE CITY OF JONESBORO TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTHEAST ARKANSAS CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER FOR THE CDBG PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM.

Attachments: [CAC Agreement](#)

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Gibson, seconded by Councilman John Street, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

RES-17:155

A RESOLUTION TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AGREEMENT WITH MID-SOUTH HEALTH SYSTEMS TO COLLABORATE IN THE REHABILITATION ACTIVITIES FOR RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FOR THE 2017 CDBG ACTION PLAN

Attachments: [Mid-South MOU Agreement](#)

Councilmember Moore addressed Mayor Perrin and said he wanted to thank his staff for following up with him. He had a question about the CDBG, this same memorandum last week, and they called me promptly the next day with an explanation.

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Gibson, seconded by Councilman John Street, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING

ORD-17:077

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 117, KNOWN AS THE ZONING ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IN ZONING BOUNDARIES FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO RM-8, RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1612 PATRICK STREET AS REQUESTED BY GARRY TATE

Attachments: [Plat.pdf](#)
[Application.pdf](#)
[Staff Summary RZ 17-10 1612 Patrick Street -- COUNICI.pdf](#)
[1612 Patrick.pdf](#)

Councilmember Street asked if there had been any concern by anyone about this rezoning. Councilmember Street motioned to waive the third reading. Councilmember Vance said he would like to make a point that we have kind of done or worked under the supposition that if we were going to try to do it in two readings, we would do two readings the first time and one reading the last time rather than one and two. I would like to voice my objection. If you want to go on and get a second, I will vote against it. Councilmember Street said that Mr. Tate has to have surgery. If there isn't any objection based on his time schedule, and there is not an objection, I see no problem doing it. Normally, we would do it as you said Councilmember Vance. I still motion that we waive the third reading to accommodate that without any objections is pretty much a formality. Councilmember Johnson said that he would second that under the

condition that there is no opposition.

Gary Tate, 2300 Manchester Drive, said that he purchased this property in early 2015. The reason I purchased it was because four friends of mine owned it. It was left in the estate from their dad. The City was in the process of condemnation. Two of those live in Texas and two of them live here. Nobody could afford to clean the property up or fix it. They have had it on the market for quite some time. They are like brothers to me so stepped up and bought it with the intention of fixing the house and selling two lots off of it. When I got into the house and got the sheetrock gutted out, I found out that it had a lot of black mold and water was standing all around it. You couldn't even see the house from the road. So, I cleaned the land up, tore the house down, and in the meantime, I got a survey and found out that the 36x48 shop building that was built on one side of it was three foot over on the other guy's property. Also, the sewer line was fifteen foot over on the other guy's property. I put those main sewer lines in in 1976 under a grant through the county. The City didn't hook the sewers up until 1989 after the mass annexation. The people out there thought the telephone poles were the property line. When I got it surveyed, the property line was 20 foot north of the telephone poles so that put their sewer line actually on someone else's property. I just tore the building down rather than argue with somebody over property. The building had been there for twenty something years. But, I thought it was the right thing to do to tear it down.

In the meantime, Perry came along and rezoned the property across the road. I had for sale signs on this property trying to sell it as single-family lots and was going to make three out of it. In a year and a half, I got nine calls. The biggest reason was that no one wanted it before Perry developed their project and the fact that the lot is 350 foot deep and 75 foot wide. They weren't interested so after the project across the road was developed, I have not received any calls. I have really cleaned the property up. It was completely overgrown with silver leaf maples. I left eight or ten large trees on it and intend to leave them on it. The reason I was so long getting it to the council was that I just recently had neck surgery. I just got over that. I am scheduled for knee surgery on November 1st and so I was wanting to get three readings because I am not going to be able to make it back to the next meeting, but I would at least like to make my point. I haven't had any opposition. At the MAPC, the vote was 7-0. The property around me is all rental property with the exception of the one house north of me. They don't have a problem with it at all. I'm needing to move forward as soon as possible if that is possible. And if it is not, I will accept whatever you all say.

Councilmember Moore said he didn't think there was any opposition to this from the Council or the public, but does two weeks make any difference to you? Mr. Tate said it was just the fact that he was not going to be able to be here in two weeks.

Councilmember Vance said to be honest with you, I don't think you need to. I am going to vote for the rezoning, but I really have a problem in doing a third reading tonight based on what we have been doing for the past several years. Mr. Tate said that was fine. He just needed tonight to state what I was going to tell you if I was here at the next meeting. I am not going to be able to be here because of surgery. If you decide not to read it a third time, that is fine with me. Thank you.

Mayor Perrin stated he had a motion and a second to waive the third reading. On the vote, there were some ayes, but the nay's were in majority so the motion to waive the third reading failed. Mayor Perrin said that it will stay and we will have our third reading. Good luck on your surgery.

This item was Held at second reading.

ORD-17:078

AN ORDINANCE TO THE CITY OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS TO AMEND THE 2017 BUDGET AND PURCHASE PROPERTY LOCATED ON MOORE ROAD

Attachments:

[boundary plat](#)
[Addendum Easton Agriculture](#)
[Gen Addendum Easton Agriculture](#)
[General Addendum Easton Agriculture](#)
[REC 110 acres, Easton Agriculture](#)
[Addendum Kings Ranch](#)
[Gen Addendum Kings Ranch](#)
[General Addendum Kings Ranch](#)
[REC Kings Ranch \(2\)](#)

Mayor Perrin said there was no rush on this. It can be held for the next reading. We are still waiting on the grant part. The Game and Fish Commission will be meeting I believe tomorrow in Little Rock. Hopefully, they will get some of that started on the grant. I will check while I am in Little Rock at the Highway Commission so we can hurry up and try to get that grant. Councilmember Street asked if that was the resolution that we passed the last time. Mayor Perrin said that was correct.

This item was Held at second reading.

ORDINANCES ON THIRD READING

ORD-17:070

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING RAISES FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS IN THE POSITIONS OF MAYOR, CITY CLERK, AND CITY ATTORNEY

Councilmember Moore asked for clarification. Our agenda showed that we read it one time. Was that the second reading or is that the third reading? City Clerk Donna Jackson said it is on the third reading. Mayor Perrin said this is the third reading. Councilmember Moore said that is what he thought. As it is the third reading, I will motion that we vote on the council and the other elected officials in two separate votes. Councilmember Vance said you cannot separate an ordinance that way. Councilmember Moore said that is a motion that I just want to vote on the council independent of the other elected officials. I am making a motion to amend the current ordinance to allow us to vote on two separate votes. One for council and one for the other elected officials. Councilmember Coleman said he seconds that. Councilmember Long asked if we could do those combined or can we separate them all? Councilmember Moore said he doesn't want to separate the other elected officials. I just want to vote on the council by itself and the rest can go. I feel we should vote on ours by doing the vote. I think we should vote on ours separate for the record. City Attorney Carol Duncan said that is going to be complicated. Councilmember Vance said that is going to be an amendment so we will have to go to another reading on it.

Ms. Duncan said she thinks if an amendment doesn't significantly change the text of the ordinance, you don't necessarily have to go to another reading. You are not saying you are going to one percent or twelve percent or no percent. I don't think it is significantly changing the details. I think it would be cleaner and I will let Donna weigh in, but I think it would be cleaner just to amend the ordinance to remove council or remove elected officials, whichever side you are removing and then come back with a separate ordinance under a separate ordinance number that addressed that. Ms. Duncan asked City Clerk Donna Jackson what would you do for record keeping purposes. Ms. Jackson asked to see the ordinance. Ms. Duncan said I feel like you are going to have two votes on one ordinance number. Do you understand what I am

saying? It will be complicated for Legistar and Donna is my concern.

Ms. Jackson said the ordinance could be amended tonight to read an ordinance authorizing raises for the following elected officials. Ms. Duncan said correct and name whichever ones. Councilmember Moore said he had no objection on us voting and amending to vote for the elected officials of the Mayor, City Clerk, and City Attorney. Ms. Duncan said that we can come back with a separate proposal for the city council. Councilmember Moore said I will let my motion reflect that.

Councilmember Coleman asked if the retroactive statement was still in the ordinance. Ms. Duncan said that was removed last time. Mayor Perrin said it was removed.

Councilmember Moore said we have a motion and a second. Mayor Perrin said that we have a motion and second on the amendment. Ms. Jackson asked who made the motion and second. Mayor Perrin said Councilmember Moore motioned and it was seconded by Councilmember Coleman. He stated that we have a motion and second to amend ORD-17:070 to read for elected officials of Mayor, City Clerk, and City Attorney. Roll call for the amendment was as follows: McClain-Aye; Long-Nay; Hafner-Aye; Bryant-Aye; Johnson-Nay; Street-Aye; Gibson-Aye; Williams-Aye; Moore-Aye; Coleman-Aye; Vance-Nay. The motion for the amendment carried 8-4 due to a majority of Aye votes.

Councilmember Hafner said I feel with other pressing budget and financial issues that we are going to be facing in the near future that I don't think that now is the time to be passing elected officials raises. I would like to see us come back at a time when we have a plan in place to address all of our issues and then look at each position separately.

Councilmember Street asked Councilmember Hafner if he planned on putting that back into next year's budget if you do that or beyond that. Councilmember Hafner said it would depend upon what I call having a plan in place to address our issues. If we get the answers next year, then we might be able to work it into next year's budget. I think it is up to council and city administration to help develop a plan that is going to address what I think our city needs as far as infrastructure, public safety, and to make sure we take care of our citizens needs first before we start looking at raising elected officials salaries. I think, based on other cities and some people don't like benchmarking against other cities, but that is the tool we use, based on population, that we are currently in line with the elected officials pay. That timeline would depend on when we get answers.

Councilmember Long stated he thinks the other issue would be in the second part. I would like to reiterate what Councilmember Hafner said, I think all of the elected officials offices needed to be separated and voted on individually because you could have one that may be in line and you may have one that may not be. To give a blanket on all three I think is not the way to go. Councilmember Vance said that he totally agrees with Councilmember Long on that. That is one of the things that I have been thinking about is that if this doesn't pass, this will give the Finance Committee the chance to come up with a plan and that would address the elected officials salaries on an annual basis to be voted on when the budget happens rather than coming up with a totally separate issue that causes everybody heartburn.

Councilmember Johnson said he agrees 100% with that statement. Councilmember Street said it could be better aligned with the budget. Councilmember Vance stated that gives time to line up with public service and with the rest of the employees to

come up with a long-term plan. We should do the same thing. I don't care if take six cities and say we are going to be 5% below the median or whatever plan you come up with, but come up with a plan that happens and makes sense on an annual basis rather than waiting three years and say hey we need this and make it retroactive. So, that is my thought. Councilmember Johnson said we put a lot of hours into planning formulas to bring everybody else in line to where they weren't so far behind. So, I agree with that 100% that I think this one needs to be planned out as well.

Councilmember Moore motioned, seconded by Councilmember Coleman, to adopt ORD-17:070. Roll call for the amendment was as follows: McClain-Nay; Long-Nay; Hafner-Nay; Bryant-Nay; Johnson-Nay; Street-Nay; Gibson-Nay; Williams-Nay; Moore-Nay; Coleman-Aye; Vance-Nay. The motion for the adoption of ORD-17:070 failed 10-1 due to a majority of Nay votes.

Councilmember Moore asked Ms. Duncan if the council will fail without any additional action or will that be considered separate. Ms. Duncan said I think you amended it and took it out so unless someone brings it back there is nothing pending for council.

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Moore, seconded by Councilman Charles Coleman, that this matter be Passed . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

Aye: 1 - Charles Coleman

Nay: 10 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

ORD-17:071

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ALCOHOL ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF JONESBORO AND ADD SECTION 6-30 TO ARTICLE II PERMITS

Attachments: [Jonesboro Application for Private Club Permit.docx](#)
[Jonesboro Application for Change in Business Operation of Private Club.doc](#)
[Jonesboro Application for Transfer of Location of Private Club Permit.docx](#)
[alcohol opposition.pdf](#)

Councilmember Moore stated he thought Mr. Bob Hester would like to speak to the Council. Mayor Perrin stated that Mr. Hester has given us a lot of stuff which we have read and he asks if Mr. Hester could please just hit the highlights.

Bob Hester, 7096 CR 333 Jonesboro, came to the podium to speak about the alcohol ordinance. He said my main concern is to make you all aware of the situation so that you can make good decisions. I will make this as quick as possible. I want to read my eight points of why I want you to pass an ordinance that will actually accomplish something and emphasize some of them. In its current form, the ordinance basically does nothing and is useless as far as preventing any new alcohol permits from being granted.

The eight reasons are as follows: 1) The private club law is illegitimate and a mockery; 2) Jonesboro is already more than adequately served with permits; 3) Alcohol is not an economic development tool. It never has been and it never will be; 4) There is no chance to stop these at the ABC in Little Rock; 5) There is an added danger with more clubs; 6) There is not adequate enforcement by ABC; 7) It is not the will of the people to have alcohol in Jonesboro; 8) Act 1112 gives you the right and the power to stop what I call this wrong.

Jonesboro is already more than adequately served with permits. One thing the ABC board can consider when granting these permits is whether the area in question is adequately served. The way that it is stated the number of existing alcoholic permits in the proposed area and whether such area is adequately served by existing outlets. They also consider the types of existing alcohol beverage permits in the proposed area. There are 44 types of alcohol beverage permits that can be granted in the state. Only one can be granted in dry counties. Of course, I maintain that that is illegal. So they are all private club permits. That is the only kind that can be granted in Jonesboro. This poses the question for me. Is there a need for any more permits in Jonesboro? To me, the answer is absolutely not. Jonesboro is not only adequately served, but is overserved. Back in 2006, State Senator Jerry Bookout wrote a letter to the ABC Board and sent a copy to the Director of Admissions Harold Ray, the Southern Baptist Missions Director. This is what Senator Bookout said: "The citizens of Jonesboro and Craighead County have made it quite clear on several occasions that they wish to prohibit the sale of alcohol in the area as much as possible. They have voted dry by margins as much as 70%. I believe as they do that there are more than enough private clubs in the area as it is now." There are about 53 private club permits inside of the city limits of Jonesboro right now and one in Bono I think. So, that would be 54 in the county and that is active permits. If I understand right, this is recent information so it is as accurate as I can be on it. At least 18 restaurants that were granted alcohol permits have gone out of business. Most of those were on Main Street. All of them but one were on Main Street I think. Of the currently active permitted places, none are full to the point of having to stand in line or being turned away on any night of the week including Friday night or Saturday night. In other words, no one is lacking a place to obtain or drink alcohol in Jonesboro. So, Jonesboro is absolutely adequately served or actually overserved.

Alcohol is not an economic development tool. It never has been and it never will be. I think a lot of people believe in this fallacy. The primary reason and almost exclusive argument used at ABC Hearings to grant these permits in dry counties is that they are necessary and good for economic development. This is a totally false premise. I have almost eight years of going down there and I have went to every one of them for Jonesboro and filmed most of them across the state. I just mentioned the 18 restaurants that have gone out of business. It was apparently not good for their economy. It was asserted that the chain restaurants that came to Jonesboro would not come to a dry county unless they could sell alcohol. Strangely, Mountain Home has been wet for many, many years, yet, Chili's, Colton's, El Chico's, and Buffalo Wild Wings are the only four chains that are located there that also located in Jonesboro. So, why haven't they opened in Mountain Home? Basically because logically they go to the places that are already booming and everybody knows that is what you do to get a piece of the pie. They did not come here to Jonesboro with a suitcase of money and say here we have all this money and we want to share it with you. Does anyone remember them doing that? No, they didn't do it. They came to get a piece of the pie. Chain restaurants initially came here without alcohol. The Chili's probably thought they would get one later on with all of the shenanigans that went on, that goes on. Chili's, Colton's, and maybe some others came to Jonesboro without alcohol at first and broke all sales records. Chili's did the same thing in Conway. If these clubs are so good for economic development, why don't they open up in the Delta so that area will benefit from economic development. Oh, that is right, the Delta is awash in alcohol. In the last handout that I gave you, it has a map of the state of Arkansas showing the counties where most of the alcohol is and if you will look at that, almost all of the alcohol was in the poorest part of the state. People can say there are other things involved in there and there may be, but I think it is primarily that.

There is no chance to stop these at the ABC in Little Rock. On one of the attachments I gave you, there are five examples that the ABC Board was determined to use their bogus interpretation and flood dry counties with alcohol regardless of how strong the opposition. That was attachment number seven. We had a case with Sai Thai where we paid an attorney to go before the ABC Board. It got shot down like always. They decided against us. We thought we had a good case and believe we did have a good case and we appealed to the appeals court. We paid an attorney to go before the appeals court. They submitted it back to the board and made the attorney go before the board. We spent \$7,500 just to go in a circle from the board to the appeals court back to the board and nothing. We paid other attorneys and that is not just here in Jonesboro. It is people from across the state. Jay Shell from Batesville in a case with Josie's was a case where they made this bogus interpretation of the law. He opposed this before the board and it got shot down. They granted the permit. He appealed directly to the Supreme Court. I didn't know you could bypass the appeals court, but apparently you can. They remanded it back to the board. It went before the board hearing and they did the same thing. They just went in a circle. There is no hope. There never has been any hope. I can get you people from all across the state. We had a rally in Little Rock several years ago on a Saturday afternoon and had 1,000 people attend that rally. They were in opposition and concerned about this situation because you can't get resolution from the ABC Board. There is no way to stop these at the ABC in Little Rock. There never has been.

There is an added danger with more clubs. More alcohol means more alcohol related problems for police to deal with. There have been two or more that have been killed as a result of these. Someone was shot and killed earlier this year on Main Street as a result of alcohol. A few years ago, someone had been drinking at Brickhouse and ran over someone on Stadium Blvd., drug them several feet down the road, and killed them. That is two that I know of. Another problem is alcohol becomes acceptable by more people when these things are allowed resulting in more young people drinking in public and becoming alcoholics. Another quote from Senator Jerry Bookout's letter is this, "Another club will add further to such law enforcement problems as public intoxication and driving while under the influence of alcohol. An additional concern I share with my constituents is that for the influence on the youngsters in our community. As you are aware, Jonesboro is a university town and we all feel that students are entitled to live in a community that provides the best possible example of moral principles by which to live. Another club would only contribute to general loosening of morality in the community." I personally find it very ironic and a lot of other people do too that the taxes from alcohol here in Jonesboro go for drunk driving enforcement and alcohol programs in our schools. I'm not saying we don't need those, but it is kind of ironic. Most people say the restaurants don't create dui's. You are not going to get drunk at restaurants. That is certainly wrong. It is certainly true that they are not going to get as drunk as at the watering holes which creates most of the problems. Nevertheless this is what the surgeon general's workshop held on drunk driving in 1988 says, "Availability of alcoholic beverages in a community can significantly affect the extent of alcohol impaired driving. The effect of small increases in availability on alcohol impaired driving are hard to measure. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of several changes can be substantial. Federal, State, and Local Governments should not adopt policies that result in increased availability of alcoholic beverages without careful analysis, study, and public debate about the potential effects on alcohol impaired driving. This applies particularly to bars, restaurants, and other public facilities since research shows that the majority of alcohol impaired drivers obtain alcohol at such places." How many people are leaving restaurants in a buzzed state? I talked to a lady just yesterday and she told me that when she drinks just a

couple of glasses of wine with a meal, she can feel the effects. She does not go to the restaurants and do this. She fixes it with her meal and drinks it at home. She said she can feel the effects of two glasses of wine. How many people are leaving these restaurants after having a couple of beers or two glasses of wine or whatever? A lot of them I would say. In the handout, you have a BAC chart. If you will look at that, you will see it does not take much to have your driving skills significantly affected or possible criminal penalties. A man of my size of about 160 lbs., a 105 would put him in that category. This is bound to be happening lots of times from these restaurants. Another one of the ploys that they use for getting these is well it is going to be a buffer between keeping the dry counties from going wet. If you have read the material, we have had nine counties go wet in the past ten years. It apparently is not a very good buffer. They have even tried to get Craighead County and some others tried. Three of them went to court and came back close. They almost went wet. It is not a very good buffer. It is one of the excuses well we have to have this to be a buffer. It didn't work.

The purpose for Act 1112 was to take the decision from ABC and give it back to the local representatives as it should be. Senator Eddie Joe Williams sponsored the bill in the legislature. In the packet I gave you is his letter. He was the Mayor of Cabot. He went before the ABC Board to oppose the granting of these private clubs in his dry city and dry county. They spurned him and didn't treat him very nice like they didn't treat anyone in opposition very nice. He realized that it was hopeless to try to convince the ABC Board to restrict these liquor licenses going to public restaurants as did everyone who appeared in opposition before the ABC Board for years. I can get local pastors from here to validate what I am saying. There are people who went down there and sat through one hearing and it was obvious to them that there was no need to come down there and oppose these things. Mr. Williams realized it was hopeless. This last session he was able to get this law. He said my reasoning for sponsoring Senate Bill 623 of 2017 was to provide local control. I feel the decision to approve a private club can best be made by local elected officials within the community rather than through individuals in Little Rock. In conclusion, if there is not some teeth in the application process with which you are proposing then it will simply be a rubber stamp of ABC and it will be an exercise in futility, a waste of time for all involved, and do absolutely nothing to protect our community from alcohol. If you just imitate or duplicate what the board has always done, then you will essentially be doing nothing, not representing the people of this city and county any more than five unelected bureaucrats on the board have done for years. I don't mean to sound harsh. If you know me, I come across as pretty firm sometimes, but I don't mean to be harsh or anything like that. But, that is just the simple fact. When does the will of the people count? They have always been completely ignored in this matter. Using Act 1112 should not be considered a burden to this council, but an opportunity to represent the people who voted this county dry by a 2 to 1 margin in the 1970's. This county should remain alcohol free until the people vote it the other way. With the opportunity given to you by this Act 1112 to create an ordinance that might curtail more alcohol in this dry city, I am asking you to consider, at least consider tabling the proposed ordinance until possibly some changes could be made to make it more effective and maybe allow some more public input. The situation with the private clubs leaves the voters wondering why they even take time to vote. I can't tell you how many times people have asked me that. What good does it do to even vote? I thank you for allowing me to come. I do appreciate it. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mayor Perrin thanked Mr. Hester.

Mr. Jim Lyons asked if they would amend the ordinance to include an emergency clause. Mayor Perrin said this does not have an emergency clause. Councilmember

McClain asked why Mr. Lyons asked for the emergency clause. Mr. Lyons said he has a client that would like to move a location. Ms. Duncan stated that this also includes transfers of location. Mr. Lyons said it is not a new permit, it is for a change of location and that is number three of the attachments. Councilmember McClain said he just wanted to know why they needed an emergency clause.

Councilmember Long stated the way the law is right now, it comes back to the council. Council gets the application. If we reject the application, can they go before the ABC Board? Ms. Duncan said that is correct.

Councilmember Long said that we have total control right here over that. Ms. Duncan said they can appeal the rejection to circuit court and then a judge can decide. Councilmember Long said he couldn't do anything about the judges, but what he can do is right here. Ms. Duncan said the judge is going to look at how our ordinance is drafted and make sure that the council followed the ordinance. Councilmember Long said in essence, what you are saying is and I looked at the permit application so if they check off on all of those checkpoints on the application and we deny it, the circuit court is going to look at that and say well, they checked everything off on the application and they met that so they are good to go. Ms. Duncan said what your ordinance contains right now and as I spoke to the committee and to the first time at council, this was a jumping off point. If there was anything that should be added or deleted that is for council to do. Our office drafted just a basic guideline for a jumping off point for council to decide what they wanted to consider. What it states now is that you are considering whether the applicant is qualified and whether the location is qualified. If you want to consider anything beyond that, then you need to make changes to what you are approving and I said that at the very beginning and at committee.

Councilmember Long said just because they meet the application requirements doesn't necessarily mean that we have to approve that application. Just because they meet and check off the requirements doesn't mean we have to approve the application. Ms. Duncan said if you change your ordinance. The way the ordinance is drafted right now, if the applicant qualifies and if the location qualifies that is what you are considering. You are looking at the applicant and you are looking at the location. By qualifies, that is zoning. Is it in the right zoning? Is it not too close to a school? The things that are on the application that we asked them to put forward. If you want other things to be considered, that needs to be put into your ordinance.

Councilmember Long asked if Act 1 was still in force, the original act from 1944 prohibiting the sale of alcohol in dry counties. Ms. Duncan said as interpreted by the Supreme Court of Arkansas, yes. Councilmember Long said right now the way that private clubs are distributing alcohol because they will not say sale alcohol is that when you become a member of a private club, you then have ownership in a common stock of alcohol and you are not actually paying for the alcohol, you are paying for the distribution mixing and serving of the alcohol. Wink. Wink. Ms. Duncan said that is the way that it has been drafted.

Councilmember Long said he would amend the ordinance to not only include whether the application meets all of the criteria, but whether or not the council feels appropriate. I don't even know how to put that. I think there needs to be other criteria other than that and one of them is whether or not that we feel that any more permits to sale alcohol is actually in line with what the people voted for twice, once in 1944 and once in 1977. I would have to amend Mr. Bob Hester's statement that it wasn't a 2 to 1 margin, it was defeated 70%.

Ms. Duncan said I would like to make a suggestion based upon what I think you are saying, I think your motion is to amend to add a requirement that council consider whether the location proposed is adequately served or has an adequate service of alcohol. Is that what you are saying? Councilmember Long said what I am trying to get at is that I don't think that permitting private clubs to sale alcohol was in the spirit or even in the letter of the law to begin with. So, I want a way in order to reject this when I vote no, I want a way to reject this not just based on whether or not they clicked off yes in the right places and no in the right places. I want to be able to put my own feelings and my own convictions as far as what I feel the people of Craighead County want and desire in order to reject these permits. Ms. Duncan said I think one way to potentially do that is that if you made the determination and you believe that the City of Jonesboro had adequate alcohol establishments. That is why I made that suggestion. If you feel that it is adequately served, then that could be one. You would need to amend the ordinance to make that one of the requirements or one of the considerations. They are still all considerations.

Councilmember Moore asked if that was one of the considerations that the ABC Board takes up is if you are adequately served. Ms. Duncan said it is on their list. Councilmember Moore said that is correct. So even if we pass the application, the ABC Board will still take up whether or not we are adequately served. Ms. Duncan said that was correct. They are supposed to. Councilmember Moore said there is nothing to stop Bobby or the Mayor or anyone else from addressing the ABC Board on the being adequately served issue at the state level. Ms. Duncan said that is correct. Councilmember Long said if you look at the history of that, ABC will not. Councilmember Moore said the question before us is not a referendum on whether or not the ABC Board is doing their job or not. It is the job of what we are going to do. I'm not making a judgment call on the ABC Board and Mr. Hester may be correct. I don't know, but that is not the question before us of whether or not they are doing their job. We are just a step in that. They are still going to consider the same criteria that they always have including whether we are adequately served or not.

Councilmember Long said my concern is that someone comes along and clicks yes or no on the application and they meet everything and I vote no. Then they appeal to the Circuit Court and the court states finds that they meet everything on the application so we are going to send it on and allow it to go to the ABC Board and then it is going to be stamped. I want a way to where we can put some teeth into the application process so even if they click all of the right boxes on the application, there is still criteria in there that would allow us to purposefully and effectively reject that application that would be meaningful and purposeful to a Circuit Court that looked at it.

Councilmember Vance said that it would appear to me that what you are saying has a lot of legitimacy. However, this is the third reading on the licensing process and I would think that the way to do this because we can amend this ordinance at any time, would be to go ahead and pass the ordinance and have the licensing in place so that we are not in jeopardy of not doing our jobs as far as the licensing process. Then, come up if you have one or if you have ten things, that you want us to consider just like we have on zoning. Then, we amend the ordinance to add those items, but not hold up the licensing process that we have come this far on. Councilmember Moore said he agreed with that.

Councilmember Hafner said this has been placed in our laps. When we have discussion on these applications and either pass or reject them, will our minutes be passed onto the ABC Board? That is a tool that they will not have, that they do not

have right now. Ms. Duncan said if you approve the application, I suppose that will be passed onto the ABC Board. If you reject the application, then it doesn't go to the ABC Board. Councilmember Hafner said it will still be in our minutes. Will our minutes be available to ABC as a matter of being with the application? Ms. Duncan said if it is rejected, they will never see them. City Clerk Donna Jackson said they would have to file an appeal. Ms. Duncan said if it is approved, then yes. I would assume they would have your minutes or the ability to have your minutes. Councilmember Vance said that is also something we could add in this amendment that the portion of our minutes that had to do with the hearing of that particular application would be attached to the application to go to the ABC Board so the ABC Board would know if it was a 5-7 vote or a 6-6 vote with the Mayor breaking the tie or if it was a unanimous vote. Ms. Duncan said she has not looked into their regulations as to whether that is something they are requiring of the applicant for them to attach. I don't know of anything that would prohibit the city from sending that. Councilmember Hafner said it makes sense for the city to do it.

Mayor Perrin said he agrees with Councilmember Vance in that we can pass this. I am hearing you Councilmember Long on your deal. If we are going to make an amendment on this thing, let's get legal involved and let's make sure that we look at everything before we amend it. All we are doing tonight is passing the ordinance on the licensing on the steps that you go through. Once someone fills out one of those applications and comes back to us, I would say we would have time to make the amendment to that before it ever gets to us. Ms. Duncan said not once they have filed their application. The ordinance in effect right then will be the one that carries. This was the conversation that I anticipated at committee. Mayor Perrin stated that what your state legislature has done is put this in your lap. Councilmember Long said I am good with that. Mayor Perrin said they did that with no guidelines whatsoever. Carol has done the best she can by taking what the State of Arkansas, the ABC has done based on their application, based on their guidelines of distance from schools and things of that nature and put it into this deal here. Then, we lacked the part about the transfers that Mr. Lyons has been talking about tonight so we had to amend that to get that in there so it would not only cover a new applicant coming in, but also a transfer. I have three on my desk right now that people have just changed employees. Ms. Duncan said they have to transfer the license. Mayor Perrin said exactly, they have to transfer the license.

Councilmember Long said he wants to propose an amendment to amend these applications because there are three of them. Ms. Duncan said the applications are not being approved technically by council. They are an attachment to this and we did that on purpose so that if we needed to make changes to the information required, it wouldn't require a vote of council. Those are just a sample application. Those can be amended without council action. So, if anybody has input on the applications, we can do that. Those aren't technically being approved by council. What is being approved is what you consider when they come here which right now is if the applicant is qualified and if the location is qualified.

Councilmember Vance said what he is asking for though and again, I have no problem with it except it doesn't need to be something we need to do tonight in one time because you are going to have to make an additional list of checklists so that if you feel you have a moral obligation to vote one way or the other, you can tag it to those items just like we do on zoning. It won't be because there are 50 for and 20 against or 50 against and 2 for. It will be based on the ordinance and those criteria in the ordinance. It actually needs to be separate from these applications. The applications are good and clear, but if you want to get it where, again we don't have any guidelines from the

legislature, if you want to get it to where we are the moral police and going to vote on it that way, you are going to need to get us a list of one to ten or fifty items that you want us to ask questions about at that meeting or else we are going to end up in court every single time. Councilmember Coleman said each judge is going to ask you if you are arbitrary and capricious and you are going to have a problem. Ms. Duncan said that is correct.

Councilmember Long said I have been arbitrary and capricious most of my time on the council. My issue is this when I ask a question. If the application which you say is absolutely no problem is checked and they do everything they say on the application and we reject that application, it goes to Circuit Court and what Carol said is that they are going to look at the application, and if they meet the criteria on the application, they are ok. Councilmember Vance said not if we add the amendment like you are talking about. We have the time to add that amendment to it unless you just want to stop and not do what the legislature told us to do. Ms. Duncan said I don't think you would have to change the application. You just need to add criteria to your ordinance if you want to consider other criteria. I think the application tells you whether the applicant is qualified. It also tells you whether the location is qualified by checking with Planning and with Police. Those are the two departments we had anticipated would look at that. If you want to add other criteria, then you need to amend to add criteria to your ordinance, not necessarily to the application. If that leads to another question on the application then we may add it, but it may not. Mayor Perrin said I don't think you are going to be the only city that does that.

Councilmember Long said I want to make sure when I vote to approve this, I don't pigeonhole myself into a corner. Councilmember Vance said one of the questions might be that would be checked off by the city is does this meet all the criteria set up by ordinance for an alcoholic permit in the City of Jonesboro. As far as I am concerned, you can come up with those criteria and we can vote on them as a council. Ms. Duncan said once this passes and takes effect in 30 days, this is the criteria until you amend it. So, if an application comes in, you can't say well we are about to change that criteria and we are going to consider it on those, you are going to have to consider it under the ones we have existing now. What I am saying is don't delay if that is your goal. Councilmember Long said he won't. Councilmember Moore said I don't think Bobby is making a judgement on any one particular business. Ms. Duncan said she knows. Mayor Perrin said she is talking about time frame. Councilmember Vance said we probably aren't going to get 50 applications tomorrow. We do need to do it in haste, but we don't have to do it and not give it the thought process.

Councilmember Moore asked where we were on this. Ms. Duncan said there was discussion of an amendment. There was a discussion of an amendment clause which hasn't made it to motion. Mayor Perrin said that was right. Ms. Duncan said at this point we either need a motion on one of those things or a motion to adopt.

Councilmember Moore motioned, seconded by Councilmember Gibson, to adopt ORD-17:071. All voted aye.

Councilmember Vance motioned to adopt an emergency clause. Ms. Duncan said that should have been done before the adoption. Now, we can't add the emergency clause. Mayor Perrin said that it won't be in effect for 30 days. That will give you time to make amendments.

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Moore, seconded by Councilman Chris Gibson, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

8. MAYOR'S REPORTS

Mayor Perrin said he wrote a letter to the City of Houston a few weeks ago to tell them that Jonesboro was thinking about them. Mayor Perrin said I got a real nice letter back from Sylvester Turner who is the Mayor of Houston thanking us and recognizing that we did get the letter. I wanted to pass that on to you all.

Mayor Perrin stated that we were notified this week that the City of Jonesboro has won this year, the Volunteer City 2017 award that will be presented at the AML Winter Conference in Ft. Smith in December. That is a great honor. Communications Director Bill Campbell wrote that and added a lot of things in there about our town. It just goes to show you that people are volunteering throughout the city. We are very pleased. This is the second time that this city has won that award.

Mayor Perrin said that on October 19, 2017, the governor and the Mexican Consulate will be here for the grand opening of the Hispanic Center. It will be held at 3:00 p.m. If you have a chance or if you can get away for a few minutes to go by there, I know that Gina Gomez and others would certainly appreciate your attendance.

Mayor Perrin stated that we got our federal audit back on our grants which was very clear. There were no exceptions on that. That is a great deal and we can send you a copy of that so you can look at it.

Mayor Perrin said there was an article in yesterday's paper and I have been meeting with the taskforce for the homeless on the HUB that we have now located at First Baptist Church. They have already served over 300 people. My hats are off to that because most of these people are volunteers. We have one man there that volunteers eight hours a day, five days a week. We are still working on the taskforce for the homeless here in Jonesboro. It is desperately needed and we will continue to do that.

Mayor Perrin said that we have on Friday night "My Healthy Jonesboro." Everyone should have gotten an invitation for that. It will be held on the Wolverine property. We have mowed and cleaned that up thanks to Steve and his crew. I am sure we will have sanitation involved in doing that too. A lot of our departments are going to be involved in this, also the Police Department and others. If you get a chance Friday night to go out, there are a lot of good sponsors. It is talking about our Healthy Jonesboro on obesity and a lot of things. Both hospitals are involved. Also, our medical school at Arkansas State University is involved. You will have a great time. There are a lot of things there for kids of any age so please go by there.

Mayor Perrin mentioned the city's Facebook page which is connecting interaction with people out in the public. He said we had 56,755 hits in one week on our City of Jonesboro Facebook page. On the Craighead Forest Park, we had 19,759 hits on that page. We had almost 4,000 for Parks and Recs for just that one week. Communications Director Bill Campbell is working with all of the departments making sure that we get their Facebook page up on the website. I just wanted to share that with you. We are reaching those people.

Mayor Perrin said that you all have received the financial reports for August and I think everyone has reviewed those. If you have any questions, you can ask me or Bill. The financial reports did look good. I will tell you that sales tax is down compared to where I thought it would be for the year. Through September, we are about \$600,000 up over last year which is only about 2.32% or a 2.23%. I thought it would be much higher than that. Hopefully, if we can keep that same pace between now and the end of December, we might be able to hit \$1 million. I am hoping we will. Sales tax is down in the City of Jonesboro. Councilmember Hafner asked about getting a copy of the financial reports since the only attachment showed the Collateralization Report. Mayor Perrin said they will get everything out tomorrow. You will be getting all that you have gotten before. Bill will make sure to get that out to them tomorrow. That shows your ABC, your A&P, your whole deal. Of course, they have a meeting tomorrow too. The Airport is doing good this year. We are having a lot of sales in fuel. They are being very active. They are ahead of last year. They are having a real good year here in Jonesboro at our airport.

COM-17:076

City of Jonesboro Federal Grants Audited Financial Statements FYE 12312016

Attachments: [COJ Federal Grants Audited Financial Statements FYE 12312016.pdf](#)

Filed

COM-17:067

CITY OF JONESBORO AUGUST 2017 FINANCIAL REPORTS

Attachments: [Required Reserves August 2017.pdf](#)
[08 2017 Revenue Report.pdf](#)
[08-2017 State Turnback Report.pdf](#)
[2017 August Rev, Exp and Changes in FB.pdf](#)
[August 2017 Hotel Tax Comparison .pdf](#)
[08 2017 Expenditure Report.pdf](#)
[08 2017 Sales tax.pdf](#)
[2017 August Franchise tax report - Copy.pdf](#)
[August 2017 Collateralization Report - Copy.pdf](#)
[August 2017 A and P.pdf](#)
[Jan. to Dec. 2017 401A Non-Uniform Pension Funds - Changes in Positions.](#)
[Jan. to Dec. 2017 Non-Uniform Pension Funds - Changes in Positions.pdf](#)

Filed

COM-17:072

Financial statements for the Jonesboro Airport Commission for September, 2017

Attachments: [JAC Jonesboro Airport Financials 09 17.pdf](#)

Filed

9. CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

Councilmember Street said as the Mayor mentioned sales tax, it was sad to see that the Sears Automotive Center is closing as everyone has seen. Don Zimmerman sent out an email that the Supreme Court is going to take up the Sales Tax Fairness case so that may be some help for cities on the horizon. I would also like to thank Wixson Huffstetler and Ronnie Shaver for their work on the replacement floor on the north side

of the Earl Bell Center. It is beautiful and that room is about like new now. The kids won't get splinters or the people who use it. I appreciate that very much. They did a great job.

Councilmember Bryant said he wanted to say thanks to the Mayor's staff. When he has had questions or his constituents have had questions, they have emailed back quickly and have been very responsive.

Councilmember Hafner said it is that time of year again where state championships are starting to happen. Today, the Jonesboro Tennis Boys and Girls both won state championships. My daughter and her partner Claire Parker repeated as double champs. Cole Spain and Christian Cato won the boys doubles championship. Hopefully with volleyball starting up next week, we will have some more.

Councilmember Gibson said that Nominating & Rules met earlier tonight. Councilmember Gibson motioned, seconded by Councilmember Moore, to suspend the rules and walk on RES-17:164 to make appointments to the A&P Commission. All voted aye.

RES-17:164

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS AND REMOVALS TO VARIOUS BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Chris Gibson motioned, seconded by Councilmember Chris Moore to suspend the rules and walk on RES-17:164 to the agenda. All voted aye.

A motion was made by Councilman Chris Gibson, seconded by Councilman Chris Moore, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

Councilmember Moore said that after he made the proposal that we consider giving away the Wolverine property, I had a lot of people call about that with positive input. I appreciate the fact that you are holding an event over there on Friday. I noticed in your invitation it said come and add your thoughts on how the space can be used to benefit our community. I would like to see that continue. One of the upsides of that is that if it is redeveloped commercially over there, we are a sales tax dependent city so there is an upside to that. I will look forward to the community offering suggestions on that to your office. Also, what is happening with the bank building? Mayor Perrin stated that we are still waiting on some answers from the attorney that we hired in Little Rock. We did discuss that with our new economic developer that has been hired through Jonesboro Unlimited. That is what he did in the state of Missouri. He had some great ideas on rehabbing that building. I will be working with him plus the comments we get from the citizens. Councilmember Moore said he will be looking forward to that.

Councilmember Coleman said he wanted to comment on how well they cleaned up the Wolverine area. It looks better than I have ever seen it. If they could just kill the grass, it would be fine.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Phillip Cook, 5216 Richardson Drive, said about five or six weeks ago, he asked a question about how much do we pay the Johansen Group to do all of these surveys for us. I never got an answer. Councilmember Hafner said that the survey he got was given out for free at the summer Municipal League Conference in Little Rock. It had all of the salaries for all of the elected officials. Mr. Cook asked if that was normal. Councilmember Hafner said that was the first time he has ever been. Mayor Perrin said yes. Mr. Cook said as a point of information, and I pointed this out five or six weeks ago, in the paper dated 12-28-2016, it says salaries for fifteen elected officials are not scheduled to change next year. Those annual salaries are and it lists each one of them. Then, we come along and Mr. McClain got knocked down about retroactive, but it is still active as far as I am concerned. Councilmember Gibson said as a point of order, this was on the agenda tonight so it cannot be brought back up. Mr. Cook said yes, but I was not given the opportunity to speak. Mayor Perrin said you can speak at those times, but again, Public Comment is only for discussion of items that are not on the agenda. Mr. Cook said he wanted to point out that when you do something like this, it makes me question the integrity of this committee. If you say you are not going to do it, then don't do it. Mayor Perrin said I think this council and this administration is totally and completely transparent. And for a city this size to have complete audits for the last nine years with absolutely no exceptions whatsoever, the federal audit on the audit side and grants side and I take exception to your comment as the Mayor of this fine city. If you want to gripe, come see me individually.

Dan Passmore, 7114 Hwy. 351, said I am the president of the Fairview Neighborhood Association. This weekend we are having our cleanup. Code Enforcement has really stepped up this year. Normally, we hand out flyers. They have actually gone out and done that for us. Sanitation has dumpsters lined up. We are expecting a big weekend. We will report back to you with how much we dig up the neighborhood at the next meeting hopefully. Mayor Perrin said thank you very much.

Heather Bunkley Allen, 6005 Charity Court, said she was here representing the "My Healthy Jonesboro" Coalition. Dr. Coleman is also a member. Basically, we are wanting everyone to know that it is a coalition of community members who are involved in making sure that we have access to healthy activities, physical fitness, and food. So, this Friday, we would love to have you guys come out. I really want to thank the city for the cleanup and for all of the support. We are having a great event. We have Jonesboro High School students out there Thursday doing more cleanup and Dr. Coleman is cooking for them. We have a lot of volunteers from ASU coming out. We have the community involved and we are looking forward to a good event. We have a free concert with Corey Jackson as well. We would like to have everyone come out and join us for some portion of that evening and the weather looks good. Thanks again for the support. Mayor Perrin said thank you for doing this. I have heard a lot of things about this. It is incredible.

D.J. Thompson, 3816 S. Culberhouse, said most of you know that I have gotten extremely involved in the past few months with Quality of Life efforts in our community. Last week the news of additional camping spots at Craighead Forest was a little troubling. In a drive through of Craighead Forest Park this morning, that is an extremely finite asset. In some of our meetings early on about fifteen months ago, the top of my Quality of Life Asset that everyone came up with immediately was Craighead Forest Park. As we move forward, I urge the city and everybody involved, the community even, to understand what a finite asset that is. To take that in mind, to

make decisions not on this is a good idea or a bad idea, but is this the absolute best usage of that very finite asset.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Councilman Mitch Johnson, seconded by Councilman John Street, that this meeting be Adjourned . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 11 - Ann Williams;Chris Moore;John Street;Mitch Johnson;Gene Vance;Chris Gibson;Charles Coleman;Bobby Long;Joe Hafner;David McClain and LJ Bryant

Absent: 1 - Charles Frierson

_____ **Date:** _____

Harold Perrin, Mayor

Attest:

_____ **Date:** _____

Donna Jackson, City Clerk